

Effects of a weak disorder on two coupled Hubbard chains

E. Orignac and T. Giamarchi

Laboratoire de Physique des Solides, Université Paris–Sud, Bât. 510, 91405 Orsay, France¹

(February 1, 2008)

Abstract

We consider the effect of weak nonmagnetic disorder on two chains of interacting fermions (with and without spins) coupled by interchain hopping. For the spinless case, interchain hopping increases localization for repulsive interactions but *stabilizes* the s-wave superconducting phase for attractive interactions. For the case with spin, the d-wave phase arising from purely repulsive interactions in the clean system is destroyed by an infinitesimal disorder while for attractive interactions, the s-wave superconductivity is more resistant to disorder than in the one-chain case.

One dimensional electronic systems are known to be the simplest realizations of non-fermi liquids, and to have generic properties known as Luttinger liquids [2–4]. Despite the good understanding of purely one dimensional systems, the effects of interchain hopping, allowing to go from one to higher (two or three) dimensions are much less known. Whether such hopping is relevant and drives the system towards a Fermi liquid fixed point or whether non-fermi liquid properties can be retained even in presence of finite hopping is still a controversial issue [5–8]. A theoretical understanding of quasi one-dimensional strongly correlated electronic systems (especially the crossover from Luttinger to Fermi liquid) would be relevant for the physics of organic conductors and may perhaps give some insights for High-Tc superconductors. Consequently, there has been in the recent years, a growing interest in systems of coupled interacting electron chains, and in particular in systems of two chains. They present the advantage to allow a careful study of the effects of the hopping, as well as to be tractable by powerful analytical [9–14] and numerical techniques [15–18]. In addition there exists good experimental realizations of such systems. For example $\text{Sr}_{n-1}\text{Cu}_{n+1}\text{O}_{2n}$ [19] and $\text{VO}_2\text{P}_2\text{O}_7$ [20] compounds are very good realizations of coupled spin chains. Upon doping, such compounds will give coupled Hubbard chains. Although the complete phase diagram of such systems is still under study, a generic property of two coupled chains system is the appearance of a *d*-wave like superconducting phase for repulsive interactions.

In this work we study the effects of non-magnetic disorder on such two chains systems, both for the case of spinless electrons and for electrons with spins. Such a study has a double interest: in experimental systems, disorder will be present, and it is therefore essential to know the stability of the phases found in the pure system. It is now well known that for a strictly one dimensional system, disorder has extremely strong effects and an arbitrarily weak disorder destroys superconductivity except for exceedingly attractive interactions [21]. In addition, on a more theoretical level, the two chain problem is the simplest one to study the effects of interchain hopping onto the Anderson localization in presence of interactions, giving some clues to the unsatisfactorily understood physics of such transition in more than one dimension. We show here that for the spinless model the superconducting phase for

attractive interactions is *stable* towards weak disorder at the opposite of what happens for a purely one dimensional system. For the model with spins and attractive interactions an arbitrarily weak disorder destroys the superconductivity if the interactions are not attractive enough as in the one chain case. Nevertheless, the threshold in interaction strength to induce superconductivity is much smaller for two chains. In particular it can now be reached for a pure Hubbard attraction at variance to the one chain case [22]. On the other hand the *d*-wave type superconductivity found for repulsive interactions is completely unstable with respect to arbitrarily weak disorder. In two spinless chains, attractive interactions *reduce* localization compared to the case of a single chain whereas repulsive ones *enhance* localization. For the case with spin, two chains are always less localized than their one chain counterpart. For each case we also compute physical quantities such as localization length and conductivity.

Let us consider first two chains of spinless fermions coupled by an interchain hopping $t_\perp$. Such model can also be mapped to two spin chains coupled by an exchange X-Y term, in the presence of a magnetic field. For simplicity we will just consider here a nearest neighbor interaction V . More complicated interactions can be considered without changing the main physical results. Details will be given elsewhere [23]. The disorder is modelled by a random on-site potential $\epsilon_{i,p}$ uncorrelated from site to site and from chain to chain. The Hamiltonian then reads

$$H = -t \sum_{i,p} c_{i,p}^\dagger c_{i+1,p} + h.c. + V \sum_i n_{i,p} n_{i+1,p} + t_\perp \sum_i c_{i,1}^\dagger c_{i,-1} + h.c. + \sum_{i,p} \epsilon_{i,p} n_{i,p} \quad (1)$$

where $p = -1, 1$ is the chain index and i is the site index.

It is convenient to rewrite the Hamiltonian in a standard boson representation [2–4]. We therefore linearize the fermions dispersion relation around k_F , introduce right movers (R) and left movers (L) for each chain. Then we take the continuum limit $c_{n,r,p} \rightarrow \sqrt{\alpha} \psi_{r,p}(n\alpha)$ with $r = L, R$, $p = \pm 1$ the chain index and α the lattice spacing. We rewrite the hamiltonian in the bonding $\psi_o = \frac{\psi_1 + \psi_{-1}}{\sqrt{2}}$ and antibonding $\psi_\pi = \frac{\psi_1 - \psi_{-1}}{\sqrt{2}}$ bands base and introduce the densities $\rho_{r,o,\pi}(x) =: \psi_{r,o,\pi}^\dagger(x) \psi_{r,o,\pi}(x) :$. We then define the canonically conjugate fields $\phi_{p,\parallel}$

and $\Pi_{\rho,\parallel}$ via :

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_x \phi_{\rho,\parallel} &= -\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2}}(\rho_{L,o} + \rho_{R,o} \pm \rho_{L,\pi} \pm \rho_{R,\pi}) \\ \Pi_{\rho,\parallel} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\rho_{R,o} \pm \rho_{R,\pi} - \rho_{L,o} \mp \rho_{L,\pi})\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

and the field $\theta_{\rho,\parallel}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \Pi_{\rho,\parallel}(x')dx'$. In term of these fields the Hamiltonian becomes for the pure case ($\epsilon_{i,p} = 0$) :

$$\begin{aligned}H &= H_\rho + H_\parallel, & H_\rho &= \int \frac{dx}{2\pi} \left[u_\rho K_\rho (\pi \Pi_\rho)^2 + \frac{u_\rho}{K_\rho} (\partial_x \phi_\rho)^2 \right] \\ H_\parallel &= \int \frac{dx}{2\pi} \left[u_\parallel K_\parallel (\pi \Pi_\parallel)^2 + \frac{u_\parallel}{K_\parallel} (\partial_x \phi_\parallel)^2 \right] + \int dx t_\perp \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \partial_x \phi_\parallel + \int dx \left[\frac{2g_\perp}{(2\pi\alpha)^2} \cos(\sqrt{8}\phi_\parallel) + \frac{2g_f}{(2\pi\alpha)^2} \cos(\sqrt{8}\theta_\parallel) \right]\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

The expressions of the K, u, g in terms of the original parameters of the hamiltonian can easily be obtained [14,23]. For the pure t-V model one has $K_\rho < 1$ (resp. $K_\rho > 1$) and $g_f < 0$ (resp. $g_f > 0$) for repulsive (resp. attractive) interactions and $K_\parallel = 1$ for all t, V . By adding interchain interactions, one has access to the cases $K_\rho > 1$ and $g_f < 0$ or $K_\rho < 1$ and $g_f > 0$. The complete phase diagram in the pure case has been obtained in [14] by a mapping on a problem of one chain of fermions with spin and spin-anisotropic interactions in a magnetic field [24]. The $t_\perp$ term suppresses $\cos(\sqrt{8}\phi_\parallel)$ so that $\theta_\parallel$ develops a gap and acquires a non-zero expectation value determined by minimizing the ground state energy. The operators with divergent associated susceptibilities are then:

$$\begin{aligned}O_{CDW^\pi} &= \psi_{R,o}^\dagger(x) \psi_{L,\pi}(x) + \psi_{R,\pi}^\dagger(x) \psi_{L,o}(x) \sim e^{i\sqrt{2}\phi_\rho} \cos(\sqrt{2}\theta_\parallel) \\ O_{OAF} &= i(\psi_{R,o}^\dagger(x) \psi_{L,\pi}(x) - \psi_{R,\pi}^\dagger(x) \psi_{L,o}(x)) \sim e^{i\sqrt{2}\phi_\rho} \sin(\sqrt{2}\theta_\parallel) \\ O_{S1} &= \psi_{L,o}(x) \psi_{R,\pi} + \psi_{L,\pi} \psi_{R,o} \sim e^{i\sqrt{2}\theta_\rho} \sin(\sqrt{2}\theta_\parallel) \\ O_{S2} &= \psi_{L,o} \psi_{R,\pi} - \psi_{L,\pi} \psi_{R,o} \sim e^{i\sqrt{2}\theta_\rho} \cos(\sqrt{2}\theta_\parallel)\end{aligned}$$

These operators describe respectively out of phase charge density waves, an orbital antiferromagnetic phase and chain symmetric “s” and chain antisymmetric “d” type superconductivity.

For $g_f < 0$ we have $\langle \theta_\parallel \rangle = 0$ giving an S2 phase for $K_\rho > 1$ and the CDW^π for $K_\rho < 1$. For $g_f > 0$ we have $\langle \theta_\parallel \rangle = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{8}}$ giving the S1 phase for $K_\rho > 1$ and the OAF phase for

$K_\rho < 1$. In [14] the bosonized forms of O_{S1} and O_{S2} are exchanged due to the neglect of anticommuting operators, so that the two superconducting phase have been erroneously exchanged.

Now, we consider the effect of the disorder. Taking the continuum limit for the on-site random potential, keeping only the $2k_F$ terms in the bosonized expressions (as the forward scattering does not induce localization [25]), and finally going to bonding and antibonding bands, one finds that the coupling to disorder is represented by two terms:

$$H_s = \int \frac{dx}{\pi\alpha} \xi_s(x) e^{i\sqrt{2}\phi_\rho} \cos(\sqrt{2}\phi_\parallel) + h.c. \quad (4)$$

$$H_a = \int \frac{dx}{\pi\alpha} \xi_a(x) e^{i\sqrt{2}\phi_\rho} \cos(\sqrt{2}\theta_\parallel) + h.c. \quad (5)$$

where $\xi_{s,a}$ are two uncorrelated gaussian distributed random potentials such that $\overline{\xi_n(x)\xi_{n'}^*(x')} = D_n\delta_{n,n'}\delta(x-x')$ with $n, n' = s, a$. In the original lattice problem, the role of $\xi_{s,a}$ would be played respectively by $\epsilon_{n,1} \pm \epsilon_{n,-1}$. We consider in the following a disorder weak enough not to destroy the gaps opened by the interchain coupling in the pure system. This corresponds to the limit $D \ll t_\perp$. The other limit where both the interchain hopping and the disorder are small compared to the other parameters by for arbitrary magnitude is only important in the vicinity of the noninteracting point. It can be studied by similar methods and will be discussed elsewhere [23]. In the weak disorder limit, $\phi_\parallel$ has huge quantum fluctuations, and consequently D_s will always be less relevant than D_a . We can therefore concentrate on the latter and forget about the former.

First, we consider the case of $g_f < 0$ (i.e. $V > 0$ for the t-V model). In that case, we can replace $\cos(\sqrt{2}\theta_\parallel)$ by its (non-zero) mean value. Then the coupling to disorder (5) reduces to $C \int dx \xi_a(x) e^{i\sqrt{2}\phi_\rho(x)} + h.c.$ and the RG equations for that problem have been derived and analysed in [21]. In particular the disorder will grow under renormalization as

$$\frac{dD_a}{dl} = D_a(3 - K_\rho) \quad (6)$$

where $l = \ln(\alpha)$ is the standard logarithmic scale associated with cutoff renormalization. (6) implies a localization-delocalization transition [21] at $K_\rho = 3$. As a consequence, the d-wave

superconducting phase is unstable in the presence of disorder except for extremely strong attractive interactions. For a simple t-V model for which $K_\rho < 1$, the CDW ground state is also unstable to disorder. The localized phase is a Pinned Charge Density Wave phase, with a localization length given by $L_{2ch.} = (1/D)^{\frac{1}{3-K_\rho}}$. This is to be compared to the localization length of a one dimensional spinless system $L_{1ch.} = (1/D)^{\frac{1}{3-2K_\rho}}$. For repulsive interactions the effects of the interchain hopping is therefore to decrease the localization length and to make the two chains system more localized. The conductivity above the pinning temperature $u/L_{2ch.}$ can be obtained by methods similar to [21] and varies as $\sigma(T) \sim T^{2-K_\rho}$.

On the other hand if one considers $g_f > 0$, i.e. attractive interactions for a t-V model, then $\langle \theta_{||} \rangle = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{8}}$ and in a first approximation $\langle \cos(\sqrt{2}\theta_{||}) \rangle = 0$ so that there is apparently no coupling at all to the disorder. Obviously, such an approximation is too crude and we must take into account the fluctuations of $\theta_{||}$ around its mean value. Keeping only the relevant terms, and integrating out the fluctuations of $\theta_{||}$ around its mean value we obtain the following effective action for ϕ_ρ :

$$S_\rho^{eff} = \int dx d\tau \left[\frac{(\nabla \phi_\rho)^2}{2\pi K_\rho} + \xi_{eff}(x) e^{i\sqrt{8}\phi_\rho(x,\tau)} + \xi_{eff}^*(x) e^{-i\sqrt{8}\phi_\rho(x,\tau)} \right] \quad (7)$$

with $\overline{\xi_{eff}(x)\xi_{eff}^*(x')} = D_{eff}\delta(x-x')$ and $D_{eff} \sim D_a^2$.

The renormalization of the disorder will again be given by an equation similar to (6), but with a coefficient $(3 - 4K_\rho)/2$ in front of D_a . The disorder is now relevant only for $K_\rho < 3/4$, leading to three different phases for $g_f > 0$: a random orbital antiferromagnet for $K_\rho < 3/4$ (with a localization length $L_{2ch.} = (1/D)^{\frac{2}{3-4K_\rho}}$), an ordered orbital antiferromagnet for $3/4 < K_\rho < 1$ and a s-wave superconducting phase for $K_\rho > 1$. For the t-V model, $K_\rho > 1$, and the “s”-wave superconducting phase is therefore *stable* with respect to weak disorder, at variance to the single chain problem. For the latter the delocalization only occurred for extremely attractive interactions i.e. $K_\rho > 3/2$. For the two chains problem the localization-delocalization transition arises in the immediate vicinity of the non-interacting point. Contrarily to the case of repulsive interactions, interchain hopping is now strongly reducing the localization effects compared to the one dimensional case. The determination

of the critical properties at the boundary between the repulsive (localized) regime and the attractive (superconducting) one, requires to treat the case where the gaps induced by the hopping and the disorder have arbitrary relative strength [23]. The conductivity now behaves as $\sigma(T) \sim T^{2-4K_\rho}$, and diverges as $T \rightarrow 0$ since the ground state is superconducting. In addition, since the disorder is less relevant for attractive interactions than for repulsive ones one can also expect the charge stiffness [26] for a disordered finite length two chains system to be larger for the attractive case than for the repulsive one, similarly to the one chain [27,22] system, but with much more dramatic effects.

Let us consider now the problem with spins. Here again, we will for simplicity only consider the case of a local Hubbard interaction. More general interactions can be treated by the same method, and give rise to a richer phase diagram [11]. The Hamiltonian is now

$$H = -t \sum_{i,\sigma,p} c_{i+1,\sigma,p}^\dagger c_{i,\sigma,p} + h.c. - t_\perp \sum_{i,\sigma,p} c_{i,\sigma,p}^\dagger c_{i,\sigma,-p} + U \sum_{i,p} n_{i,\uparrow,p} n_{i,\downarrow,p} + \sum_{i,\sigma,p} \epsilon_{i,p} n_{i,\sigma,p} \quad (8)$$

The pure system can again be studied by using a boson representation. One introduces similar fields than in (2) for each spin degree of freedom, and make the symmetric (charge) $\phi_\rho = \phi_\uparrow + \phi_\downarrow$ and antisymmetric (spin) $\phi_\sigma = \phi_\uparrow - \phi_\downarrow$ linear combinations. One ends with four bosonic fields instead of two for the spinless case. The bosonized Hamiltonian is quite lengthy and will not be reproduced here for reasons of space. It can be found in [11], and we will use in the following the notations of this paper. All physical quantities depends on a parameter $K_{\rho+}$ of the symmetric charge mode, analogous to the K_ρ of the spinless problem. For the purely repulsive case, $U > 0$, only one of the four bosonic fields that describe the low-energy physics of the system ($\phi_{\rho+}$) is gapless [11]. The mean values of the 3 other fields are determined by minimizing the energy of the ground state giving $\langle \theta_{\rho-} \rangle = 0$, $\langle \phi_{\sigma+} \rangle = \frac{\pi}{2}$, $\langle \phi_{\sigma-} \rangle = \frac{\pi}{2}$, leading to a d-wave superconductive phase [11]. For the attractive case $U < 0$, $\phi_{\rho+}$ is again massless in the pure case. But now, we have $\langle \theta_{\rho-} \rangle = 0$, $\langle \phi_{\sigma+} \rangle = 0$, $\langle \phi_{\sigma-} \rangle = 0$. Here, the most divergent fluctuations are associated with the operator $O_{SCs} \sim e^{i\phi_{\rho+}} \cos(\phi_{\sigma+}) \cos(\phi_{\sigma-})$ which is the order parameter for s-wave superconductivity.

The coupling to disorder arises again via two terms

$$H_a = \int \xi_a(x) O_{CDW^\pi}(x) + \xi_a^*(x) O_{CDW^\pi}^\dagger(x) dx \quad (9)$$

$$H_s = \int \xi_s(x) O_{CDW^o}(x) + \xi_s^*(x) O_{CDW^o}^\dagger(x) dx \quad (10)$$

Where $\overline{\xi_n(x)\xi_{n'}(x')^*} = D_n\delta_{n,n'}\delta(x-x')(n, n' = a, s)$, the ξ_n being random gaussian distributed potentials. The operators O represents charge density waves : CDW^o is the in-phase charge density wave, and CDW^π is the out of phase one.

Assuming again that the disorder is weak enough not to destroy the gaps, the O operators have the simple form for repulsive interactions

$$O_{CDW^o} \sim e^{i\phi_{\rho+}} \sin(\phi_{\rho-}) \quad (11)$$

$$O_{CDW^\pi} \sim e^{i\phi_{\rho+}} \sin(\theta_{\sigma-}) \quad (12)$$

These two operators have exponentially decaying correlation functions and no direct coupling with disorder would exist if one just took into account the mean values of the fields $\phi_{\rho,-}$ and $\theta_{\sigma,-}$. As in the spinless case one should integrate over fluctuations to get the effective coupling

$$S_{\rho+}^{\text{disorder}} = \int \xi_{\text{eff.}}(x) e^{i2\phi_{\rho+}(x,\tau)} dx d\tau + h.c. \quad (13)$$

One can also view (13) as the coupling of the fermions with the $k_{Fo} \pm k_{F\pi}$ Fourier component of the disordered potential. The problem has in fact been reduced to a problem of spinless fermions. The localization-delocalization would occur at $K_{\rho+} = 3/2$ but purely repulsive interaction imply $K < 1$. The d -wave phase is therefore unstable to arbitrarily weak disorder. The symmetric (10) and the antisymmetric (9) part of the disorder contribute equally to destroy the d -wave superconductivity, in contrast with the spinless case where the antisymmetric part was the most relevant. The localization length in that phase is $L_{2ch.} \sim (1/D)^{2/(3-2K_{\rho,+})}$, and therefore longer than the corresponding one $L_{1ch.} \sim (1/D)^{1/(2-K_{\rho,+})}$ of the one dimensional spinning chain. The two chains problem is less localized than the corresponding one dimensional one even for repulsive interactions, in

contrast with the spinless case. This is in qualitative agreement with what one expects in the absence of interactions where the localization length is proportional to the number of channels in the system.

For the attractive case, the O operators take a different simplified form, due to the different gaps in the system

$$O_{CDW^o} \sim e^{i\phi_{\rho+}} \cos(\phi_{\rho-}) \quad (14)$$

$$O_{CDW^\pi} \sim e^{i\phi_{\rho+}} \sin(\theta_{\sigma-}) \sin(\phi_{\sigma+}) \quad (15)$$

By substituting in (9) and (10) and integrating over fluctuations we end with an action of the form (13). This time, $K_{\rho,+} > 1$, so that we can attain the localization-delocalization transition at $K = 3/2$. The delocalization transition arises for much weaker attraction than in the one dimensional case [21] $K_\rho = 3$. For the two chains problem the critical value of K can be attained for a Hubbard model [28,22] whereas the one dimensional Hubbard model is always localized even for very negative U [22]. In addition the localization length is increased : $L_{2ch.} = (\frac{1}{D})^{\frac{2}{3-2K_{\rho+}}}$ whereas in the one chain case $L_{1ch.} = (\frac{1}{D})^{\frac{1}{3-K_\rho}}$. At the opposite to what happens for the one dimensional case where the attractive localization length was smaller than the repulsive one [29,21], here the two lengths are the same, up to prefactors. Therefore, the enhancement of charge stiffness by repulsive interactions found in the one chain case [22] ought to be absent for 2 chains, or at least strongly reduced. Such an issue would need a more detailed study. The conductivity behaves as $\sigma(T) \sim T^{2-2K_{\rho+}}$.

Clearly, these effects are due to the existence of a spin gap and to the freezing of interchain charge excitations [11]. As a consequence, it would be worth studying the localization effects in a three chains model (where there should be no spin-gap) to see if the delocalization effect of attractive interaction does persist or if we fall back to the one chain case.

We are grateful to H.J. Schulz for many useful discussions.

Note added: After completion of this work, we learned about the work of Kawakami and Fujimoto [30]. These authors considered the related, albeit different problem of disordered coupled Hubbard chains with a ferromagnetic Hund's exchange and no hopping. They also

find reduction of the localization effects in this system.

REFERENCES

- [1] Laboratoire associé au CNRS.
- [2] V. J. Emery, in *Highly Conducting One-Dimensional Solids*, edited by J. T. D. et al. (Plenum, New York, 1979), p. 327.
- [3] J. Sólyom, Adv. Phys. **28**, 209 (1979).
- [4] F. D. M. Haldane, J. Phys. C **14**, 2585 (1981).
- [5] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 1839 (1990).
- [6] C. Bourbonnais and L. G. Caron, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **5**, 1033 (1991).
- [7] H. J. Schulz, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **5**, 57 (1991).
- [8] V. M. Yakovenko, JETP Lett. **56**, 5101 (1992).
- [9] M. Fabrizio, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 15838 (1993).
- [10] A. M. Finkelstein and A. I. Larkin, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 10461 (1993).
- [11] H. J. Schulz, 1994, cond-mat preprint 9412098.
- [12] L. Balents and M. P. A. Fisher, 1995, cond-mat preprint 9503045.
- [13] N. Nagaosa and M. Oshikawa, 1994, cond-mat preprint 9412003.
- [14] A. Nersesyan, A. Luther, and F. Kusmartsev, Phys. Lett. A **176**, 363 (1993).
- [15] R. Noack, S. White, and D. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 882 (1994).
- [16] E. Dagotto, J. Riera, and D. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 5744 (1992).
- [17] D. Poilblanc, H. Tsunetsugu, and T. M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 6511 (1994).
- [18] H. Tsunetsugu, M. Troyer, and T. M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 16078 (1994).
- [19] M. Takano, Z. Hiroi, M. Azuma, and Y. Bando, J. Solid State Chem. **95**, 230 (1991).

- [20] R. S. Eccleston, T. Barnes, J. Brody, and J. W. Johnson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 2626 (1994).
- [21] T. Giamarchi and H. J. Schulz, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 325 (1988).
- [22] T. Giamarchi and B. S. Shastry, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 10915 (1995).
- [23] E. Orignac and T. Giamarchi, 1995, article in preparation.
- [24] T. Giamarchi and H. J. Schulz, J. Phys. (Paris) **49**, 819 (1988).
- [25] A. A. Abrikosov and J. A. Rhyzkin, Adv. Phys. **27**, 147 (1978).
- [26] W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. **133**, A171 (1964).
- [27] G. Bouzerar, D. Poilblanc, and G. Montambaux, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 8258 (1994).
- [28] N. Kawakami and S. K. Yang, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 7844 (1991).
- [29] Y. Suzumura and H. Fukuyama, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **52**, 2870 (1983).
- [30] N. Kawakami and S. Fujimoto, 1995, cond-mat preprint 9506118.